Ham-Policy Digest   Fri, 23 Sep 94   Volume 94 : Issue 459

Today's Topics:
                          5 wpm, you can too!
                             Get Over It
                       Thanks for PRB-1 replies!!
            Welcome back, Robert Coyle (was Re: Get Over It)
                           Why we need code

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 1994 07:56:49 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: 5 wpm, you can too!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>John Mollan - Harm <jmollan@egreen.iclnet.org> writes:

>>When it gets right down to it, If you's only put the time that has been
>>spent fussin' and fightin' into learning the code, there would be nothing
>>left to argue about.

>I have tried, off and on, for over twenty years. The characters do not sink
>in worth a darn.

Then how'd you learn the alphabet, Ed?

Maybe it's the technique your using. The best method goes something
like this:

. e
.. i
... s
.... h
..... 5   and once you've mastered those then go on to:

- t
-- m
--- o
----- 0   then:

.- a
..- u
...- v
....- 4

-. n
-.. d
-... b

--. g
----. 9

I think you can see the pattern. I made up a tape as a young pup
organizing the letters as above (each group's letters were
random on the tape); after the 2nd group was mastered then
the 1st and 2nd groups were combined, etc.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 1994 02:22:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-
feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!
mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Get Over It
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5C3w3Vp.brunelli_pc@delphi.com>, brunelli_pc@delphi.com
(brunelli_pc@delphi.com) writes:
>
>Jeff, the simplicity of CW gear is not a justification for CW
>profociency. We should be looking to make complicated designs

>accessible through education. Building a 30 year old circuit,
>many times over, is not furthering the technical
>state-of-the-art.
>
I'm all for educating hams to understand complicated designs. I think
the way you generally teach complicated subjects is to begin with the
simplest elements and proceed from there. Simplest elements, now what
might those be? As far as building 30 year old circuits, it's true that
this does not contribute to furthering the technical state-of-the-art,
but it *can* contribute to "advancing skills in both the communication
and technical phases of the art."

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 22 Sep 94 13:07:30 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Thanks for PRB-1 replies!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>But the fact of the matter is that there have been radio towers (b
>mmercial, now why is there all this trouble? I dont get it.
>Jim N2ETE

why is there all this trouble? because people in general seem to want to be
busybodies, stick their nose into everyone's business, and take great pleasure
in being able to tell others what to do. and they demand conformity at all
costs -- "why do you have that antenna on your car" is the question, not
"what's that antenna on your car?" as if the presence of your antenna on your
car (something different than their "normal") must be challenged and
ultimately eliminated. These folks were probably 60's "Do Yer Own Thing"
folks...

probably comes from all that "you must cooperate!" education people have been
getting for years when they were kids and when they grow up and the controls
are released, they turn stark raving intolerant. would be interesting to see
one of the "educational" programs have a "cooperation" lesson that one or two
people would refuse to work on the group project while at the same time
completeing a project independantly (showing that there can be the possibility
of more than one solution to a problem..and that just maybe a group won't come
up with an optimal answer...)

73, bill

Date: 22 Sep 1994 05:19:25 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!
howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!koriel!
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network
Subject: Welcome back, Robert Coyle (was Re: Get Over It)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 67p@sugar.NeoSoft.COM, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)
writes:
>In article <35p9ru$7l1@cat.cis.brown.edu>,
>Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> wrote:
>>In article <35o5lm$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
>> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:
>>
>>|> I have followed the newsgroup for some time now, and it appears that the
>>|> vast majority of the "whining" you cite is coming from just a few rather
>>|> vocal posters. It also appears to me that they will continue to whine
>>|> until someone of significant power yields to their faulty logic and
>>|> grants them privileges they refuse to earn through mastery of Morse.
>>
>>Unfortunately, their faulty logic doesn't only limit itself to Usenet.
>>I hear new no-clues on local 2 meter repeaters talking to fellow no-clues
>>about wanting HF access, as if they have somehow forgotten over the
>>intervening 8 weeks it took their license to arrive that HF access
>>requires code.
>
>Never underestimate the power of human stupidity.
>
>--
>"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Given there's no Michael Mancini in the callbook, and your signature
is quite familiar, one has to guess the Michael Mancini name is a
pseudonym. In fact, I'd guess you are really Robert Coyle, back again
to contribute nothing useful and plenty of flames. Forgive me if I'm wrong.

---
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
     *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"   *

Date: 22 Sep 94 13:20:03 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu

Subject: Why we need code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>You mean you pro-CW people are now lobbying the toy industry!??

actually, they haven't been - otherwise there'd be a "how to learn morse code"
book in every shipment of 49 MHz walkie-talkies...

>Heck, even when I was a KID I knew Dick Tracy had a 1 megabaud DS spread-

yeah, but Diet Smith only sold 'em to Tracy's department. could never get 'em
to acknowledge a PO from us...(boy, did the DT Movie stink...must have been
written by someone who never read the strip. they kinda soft pedal the props
on the backlot tour at MGM/Disney last time i was there.)

73, bill wb9ivr

Date: 16 Sep 1994 19:58:02 GMT
From: ncar!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!sedona!cmoore@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cw5sMI.IwD@news.hawaii.edu>, <359olr$3jv@chnews.intel.com>,
<Cw79F9.8Fw@news.hawaii.edu>e
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

In article <Cw79F9.8Fw@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:
>Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>
>>Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:
>
>See the *** paragraph above: AM provides for an affordable xcvr but
>there'll be no one to chat with!

Hi again Jeff, I have AM on both my IC-745 at home and my IC-725
mobile. I'll be glad to chat with anyone on AM... I just can't
find anyone, and I wonder why. It tends to make me think that almost
all active hams, world-wide, have both CW and SSB capabilities.

>Do you consider that an attack upon youself? It sure wasn't meant to be.

"Attack" may have been too strong a word... sorry. It seemed that you
strongly objected to my use of the word "primitive". The dictionary
says it means "rudimentary technology" which was my meaning regarding
third-world countries. You are, of course, right about Homo sapiens,

average IQ = 100 no matter where they might live.

Some have said that there is little AM because there is no one to talk
to. I suspect that a not neglible number of HF transceivers have AM/FM
capability. There's got to be a lot of CW/AM transmitters left over
from the 50's. Are they all being used only for CW?... or not being
used at all because everyone has IC-7xx's?

--
73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC   Most of the doors in amateur radio can
(Not speaking for Intel)   not be opened by a -.-. .-- key.

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 01:37:37 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35mljm$oqu@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <pa7S-J+.edellers@delphi.com>,
<35pak9$7l1@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:

>No, in radio there is *no* difference. Little more than common sense is
>required to get an amateur station on the air today. You buy a radio, you
>buy an antenna, and you buy 50' of coax with connectors already attached,
>and you can have a station up in under an hour. The skills required to put
>an amateur station on the air today are little more than those required to
>connect a TV antenna to a TV set in your living room.

I'd suggest that understanding SWR, RF safety and operating procedures are
quite a bit more than what you're referring to -- especially operating
procedures and regulations. The "ham" who goes out and buys a rig and puts it
on the air without knowing those will stink up the band just as badly as any
CBer -- but that has nothing to do with whether or not that person understands
Morse Code.

>That's exactly what you're saying. Oh, wait, but code isn't relevant, you
>say. Well, we've covered that topic before, and for one moment let's say
>that I actually agree with you on that topic (which I don't). Well, hey,
>knowing how to construct a dipole isn't relevant today either, if I buy
>all my antennas from Cushcraft.

Knowing how to CONSTRUCT an antenna probably isn't relevant either. Knowing
how to SELECT a type of antenna for a given application (say, for example, that
a beam might well be better for HF DXing than a trap vertical) definitely is.

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 01:31:02 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Jm3RX38.edellers@delphi.com>, <35mljm$oqu@cat.cis.brown.edu>,
<35o5lm$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> writes:

>I have followed the newsgroup for some time now, and it appears that the
>vast majority of the "whining" you cite is coming from just a few rather
>vocal posters. It also appears to me that they will continue to whine
>until someone of significant power yields to their faulty logic and
>grants them privileges they refuse to earn through mastery of Morse.

What is "faulty" about the contention that mastery of Morse is not necessary
for the effective use of other modes on HF?

>And like you, Michael, I have absolutely no sympathy for these lazy bastards.

WHAT lazy bastards? I haven't seen evidence of any present here.

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 01:42:39 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35o5lm$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <092194204343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<35qr4e$6ds@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> writes:

>Are you one of the "many" who have passed the 20 WPM test, and thus earned
>their Extra class license? If so, then you have just qualified your
>arguements against the code requirement. If not, you are a whiner. Period.

Ah, yes. Yet another dirty trick of the debating game -- inventing ways to
"disqualify" your opponents rather than responding rationally to their
positions.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #459
****